



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

MAILED

JAN 29 2008

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.  
1950 Roland Clarke Place  
Reston, VA 20191

In re Application of: HASHIMOTO et al.  
Application No. 10/596,107  
Filed: 31 May 2006  
For: REPRODUCTION DEVICE

DECISION ON PETITION  
TO MAKE SPECIAL  
(ACCELERATED EXAMINATION)  
UNDER M.P.E.P. § 708.02 (VIII)

This is a decision on the petition filed 23 August 2006, under 37 C.F.R. 102(d) and M.P.E.P. § 708.02(VIII): Accelerated Examination, to make the above-identified application special.

The Petition is **DISMISSED**.

M.P.E.P. § 708.02, Section VIII which sets out the prerequisites for a grantable petition for Accelerated Examination under 37 C.F.R. § 102(d) states in relevant part:

A new application (one which has not received any examination by the examiner) may be granted special status provided that applicant (and this term includes applicant's attorney or agent) complies with each of the following items:

- (a) Submits a petition to make special accompanied by the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(h);
- (b) Presents all claims directed to a single invention, or if the Office determines that all the claims presented are not obviously directed to a single invention, will make an election without traverse as a prerequisite to the grant of special status;
- (c) Submits a statement(s) that a pre-examination search was made, listing the field of search by class and subclass, publication, Chemical Abstracts, foreign patents, etc. The pre-examination search must be directed to the invention as claimed in the application for which special status is requested. A search made by a foreign patent office satisfies this requirement;
- (d) Submits one copy each of the references deemed most closely related to the subject matter encompassed by the claims if said references are not already of record; and
- (e) Submits a detailed discussion of the references, which discussion points out, with the particularity required by 37 CFR 1.111 (b) and (c), how the claimed subject matter is patentable over the references.

In this case, the petition filed 23 August 2006 fails to adequately meet the requirement (e) as set forth supra. The discussion of the references does not point out with the particularity required by 37 CFR 1.111(b) and (c) how the claimed subject matter is patentable over the references. The discussion fails to specifically point out how the **language** of independent claim 1 patentably distinguishes them from **each** of the **references**.

For each of the references deemed most closely related, it is stated that the reference fails to disclose or teach "designating images and rendition times in predetermined codes, executing the predetermined codes through control information included in a video stream, ...". However, this limitation, which is purported to distinguish the independent claim from the references, are not required by the independent claim.

Petitioner should ensure that the above discussion is directed to how the language of each of the independent claims is **specifically** distinguishable and patentable from each of the references provided in requirement (d) above, rather than to repeat essentially the entirety of each of the independent claims. The identification must be accurate and consistent with the language set forth in the (independent) claims of the instant application. In the discussion of the references, Petitioner is required to point out (substantively detail) the prior art elements and associations germane to the claims to fully flesh-out the comparison between the referenced prior art and Applicant's claimed features.

Petition to Make Special **DISMISSED**.

Petitioner is given one opportunity to perfect the petition. Any request for reconsideration must be filed within TWO MONTHS of the mail date of this decision.

Until the renewed petition is submitted, the application will be returned to the examiner's docket to await treatment on the merits in the normal order of examination.



Mano Padmanabhan  
Quality Assurance Specialist, Technology Center 2100, Workgroup 2180  
Computer Architecture, Software and Information Security  
571-272-4210